

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Research Background

Discourse analysis is an analysis of language which focuses on investigation about how to use language correctly (Brown & Yule, 1983; Edwards, 2008; Hyland, 2005). In terms of the investigation, a language can be divided into two kinds, written language and spoken language. They are different in how to produce the language. In discourse analysis, there are many fields of study. This study focuses on genre analysis of text which can be analyzed based on the rhetorical features. Metadiscourse as the subject of the study is known as one of the rhetorical features (Swales, 1990).

In the past, some studies have been conducted in the development of metadiscourse features of research articles (RAs) (Del Saz-Rubio, 2011; Hyland, 2005a; Loi & Lim, 2013; Mur-Dueñas, 2011; Peterlin, 2005). RAs as the academic writing should be effectively understandable so as to deliver the idea and the aim of the texts. Therefore, the use of metadiscourse is important as the support in understanding the text. Metadiscourse is known as the reflective language used to interact between readers and writers or speakers and listeners. It depends on how the users display the metadiscourse itself. Especially in writing text, it can be used in expressing the important meanings correctly, in organization text, and interaction between them for understanding the text (Fa-gen, 2012). The types of metadiscourse has been revised time to time. Early study as Crismore

(1984) differs it into two parts: “informational” and “attitudinal”. The division is based on the signal presence of author and the signal attitude of author. Recently, Hyland (2005) argues that metadiscourse become two general categories “interactive” and “interactional.” It divides it based on the text function. Firstly, it includes such sub- classifications as: “transition markers,” “frame markers,” “endophoric markers,” “evidential,” and “code glosses” and secondly, it includes such sub- classifications as: “hedges,” “boosters,” “engagement markers,” “attitude markers,” and “self-mentions.” Specifically, metadiscourse has many variant usages in languages and disciplines difference in RAs. For instance, Mu, Zhang, Ehrich, & Hong (2015) find that Chinese and English applied the different attention in using metadiscourse based on Hyland’s model in RAs. The English RAs used more interactional metadiscourse than Chinese RAs. The result demonstrates that the English pays more attention to the interaction between the writers and their readers. In addition, it shows the different ways of metadiscourse features used between both of them. Thus, it is likely that the metadiscourse features understanding in academic article will be advantageous in discovering knowledge among languages and cultures.

Moreover, this study also focused based on Hyland’s metadiscourse model. Mu, Zhang, Ehrich, & Hong (2015) state to investigate the use of metadiscourse in a genre- based approach study it is important to determine the suitable metadiscourse features in discipline of applied linguistics. Furthermore, it states Hyland's model is a genre based and has been existed from other metadiscourse studies. In addition, it claims the previous taxonomy had been built by Hyland’s

model, then it arranged the model of metadiscourse more accurately. Also, it is the latest metadiscourse model which is clear, simple, and inclusive (Abdi, Rizi, & Tavakoli, 2010). More importantly Hyland's model had been applied in such of studies (Abdi et al., 2010; Del Saz-Rubio, 2011; Lee & Subtirelu, 2015; Loi & Lim, 2013; McGrath & Kuteeva, 2012; Mu et al., 2015). Therefore, as reasons mentioned above, it is clear that metadiscourse of Hyland's model is suitable to apply in this study.

This study focuses on metadiscourse features among cross- linguistic in RAs. To date, there are numerous studies identified that English compare in other languages in using metadiscourse such as: Chinese (Mu et al., 2015), Turkish (Ozdemir & Longo, 2014), Iranian (Gholami, Tajalli, & Shokrpour, 2014), Spanish (Moreno, 1997; Mur-Dueñas, 2011; Vergaro, 2004), Slovene (Peterlin, 2005), Persian (Zarei & Mansoori, 2011), and Spanish and Norwegian (Dahl, 2004). These studies indicate that it has been common to compare the use of metadiscourse of English with other languages. However, to the best of the researcher knowledge, comparing English native writers with Indonesian writers in term of their use metadiscourse is hardly ever done. This fact refers as the gap for the current research. Considering this gap, this paper attempts to compare the use of metadiscourse by English native and Indonesian writers in their English abstract of RAs. Moreover, this study investigates how English native and Indonesian writers construct their metadiscourse choices through their knowledge in their writings.

1.2 Research Problems

Based on the background of the study above, the problems of this study are stated as follows:

1. What are the similarities and differences in the use of metadiscourse between English and Indonesian applied linguistics in their English research article abstracts?
2. How do they use of interactive and interactional metadiscourse in their English abstract of RAs?

1.3 Research Objective

According to research problem above, the objectives of research are as follow:

1. To identify the significant differences between English native and Indonesian writers use the metadiscourse in their writing of abstract of RAs
2. To investigate the way that they use interactive and interactional metadiscourse in their English abstract of RAs

1.4 Scope and Limitation

As noted above, discourse analysis has many fields of studies to conduct. However, this study focuses on one of the crucial part of discourse analysis, namely metadiscourse. Metadiscourse has been developed time to time. It has

many types across experts. Previously, early study categorizes metadiscourse into: “informational” and “attitudinal”. This study focuses on the latest metadiscourse categories based on Hyland’s model (i.e. interactive and interactional metadiscourse).

This paper aims to investigate and to identify the use of metadiscourse between Indonesian and native English writers in their RAs. Although there are many parts of RAs, this paper specifically focuses on the abstract of RAs. The data utilized in this study is gathered from different texts based on local and international journals in English language. Furthermore, the journals only focus on the field of TESOL and applied linguistic.

1.5 Research Significance

1. Discourse analysis teachers

As metadiscourse and corpus are acknowledged as two main parts of discourse analysis, this paper can be one of references to support the discourse learning. Hence, it is expected that this study helps the teacher to introduce and to teach the importance of metadiscourse role in the discourse learning itself.

2. English teachers

As English teachers, there are four main skills that they should teach to their students comprehensively such as reading, speaking, listening, and writing. Different skills need to have different way of how to teach them, especially in writing skill. When students learn how to write, the coherence is one of important

things to make good writings. Because metadiscourse has the function to keep the interaction between readers and writers in understanding the text, teachers can introduce how to use metadiscourse in writings.

In order to make the metadiscourse easy to be understood by the students, teachers should be aware of the way how to teach the metadiscourse. They should well understand the differences of definition through metadiscourse features and how they are applied in the text.

3. Students

In writing class, every student will produce their writings. In order to make their writings good and coherent, they have to know how to make relation between them, as the writer and their readers. The use of metadiscourse is essential to increase the understanding of the text. Therefore, to make a good text based on correct use of metadiscourse, the students have to understand the different function of metadiscourse features and how they would be applied in the text.

4. Research in the field

Metadiscourse is the completely a new concept in the text analysis area. Despite the importance of metadiscourse several studies have been investigated in different angles recently, it is commonly done the investigation about the use of metadiscourse between two different languages. Surprisingly, the metadiscourse investigation for Indonesian is hardly ever done. In this perspective, the future researcher will consider this gap for the study to contribute the knowledge of metadiscourse use in Indonesian context. As a good reference, this study can be

one of it in the metadiscourse investigation studies. Further, this study could be one of research article that introduces the Indonesian context in metadiscourse research.

1.6 Definition of Key Terms

1. Discourse analysis is an analysis of language which focuses on investigation about how to use language correctly (Brown & Yule, 1983; Edwards, 2008; Hyland, 2005). The two of essential aspects of discourse which are used in this study are metadiscourse and corpora, the former is use to express the important meanings correctly, to organize text, and to make interaction between them for understanding the text (Fa-gen, 2012) and the latter is to give us the information how the language is used.

2. Interactional metadiscourse is commonly used to involve the readers in the text and to give them opportunities to respond what the perspective of the writer is (Hyland, 2005).

3. Interactive metadiscourse uses to make the readers find the coherence and the conveyance of the text (Hyland, 2005).